

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for conducting an interview with Applicant's representative on November 23, 2010. During the interview, differences between step (d) of claim 25 and the Ito patent (US 6,314,369) were discussed. Proposed amendments to clarify these differences were also discussed. The amendments to claim 25 shown above correspond to the proposed amendments. Additionally, step (b) of claim 25 is amended to improve its readability.

Claims 25, 26, 34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ito et al (US 6,484,093).

Claims 17-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Ito in view of Ahrens et al (US 2002/0010542), and further in view of Bruner et al (US 7,243,134).

Applicant submits that Ito does not teach or suggest "a step in which the information distribution center transmits to the information terminal all of the route information for the recommended route contained in a result of the route search calculation at once, the first piece of the guide information after the transmission of all of the route information, and the second piece of the guide information after the transmission of the first piece of the guide information

separately from the first piece of the guide information," as claimed in amended claim 25.

According to claim 25, as amended, all of the route information for the recommended route is sent to the terminal at once, in advance of the pieces of guide information which are sent afterward. The guide information for guiding the driver along the route is divided and the first piece of the guide information is sent to the terminal before sending the second piece of guide information. Upon receipt of the first piece of the guide information by the terminal, which has already received all of the route information for the recommended route, the terminal starts route guidance for the vehicle. This configuration enables the driver to know the whole route (i.e., all of the route information) at a glance as well as the guide information in the area near the start point at the beginning of the route guidance process. This reduces the time required for the driver to download the information necessary for starting the vehicle guidance.

By contrast, Ito discloses a technology in which the route information and the guide information are divided into a sequence of portions of combined route/guide information which are sent to the driver in a sequence along the route – one portion of route/guide information at a time. Thus, according to Ito, the driver can know only the route/guide information on the route within the range of the first portion of the sequence of route/guide information at the time of starting the vehicle. Further, until a point is reached where the last portion of route/guide information is received, the driver cannot know all of the route

information for the recommended route to the destination. As a result, the driver cannot judge whether or not the recommended route is acceptable, and thus the driver cannot change the route in advance in case the route information for an unacceptable route is distributed to him or her. Thus, Ito fails to teach or suggest transmitting all of the route information for the recommended route at once to the information terminal.

Therefore, amended claim 25 is patentable over Ito.

Claims 26, 34 and 36 are patentable due to their dependence from claim 25.

Claims 17-22 are patentable due to their dependence from claim 25 and because Ahrens and Bruner do not make up for the above-identified deficiencies of Ito.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323, Docket No. 029267.56376US.

Respectfully submitted,

December 6, 2010



Jeffrey D. Sanok
Registration No. 32,169
Cameron W. Beddard
Registration No. 46,545

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
JDS:CWB:err
13891832